



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/576,116	05/22/2000	Matthew Lennig	003932.P014	2810
7590	12/04/2003		EXAMINER	AZAD, ABUL K
Jordan M. Becker Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor, & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	
				DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/576,116	LENNIG, MATTHEW	
	Examiner ABUL K. AZAD	Art Unit 2654	

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-5,8-20,26-31,34-37 and 39-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 14-20 and 41 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-5,8-13,26-31,34-37,39 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)           | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on September 15, 2003.
2. Claims 2-5, 8-20, 26-31, 34-37 and 39-41 are pending in this action. Claims 2-5, 8, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 35 and 39 have been amended. Claims 1, 6, 7, 21-25, 32, 33 and 38 have been canceled.
3. The indicated allowability of claims 8-13, 31, 32, 39 and 40 are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Lee (US 6,067520). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 2-5, 8-13, 26-31, 34-37 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peckham et al. (EP 0 424 071) in view of Lee (US 6,067,520).

As per claim 8, Peckham teaches, "a method comprising":

"inputting speech representing an utterance and having an intonation" (Page 5, lines 32-33, particularly reads on "the input words are analysed to extract normalized cepstral coefficients and pitch" where "intonation" reads on "pitch"); and  
"identifying an endpoint of the utterance based on the intonation" (Page 14, lines 55-56, particularly reads on "the use of pitch information, preferably in combination with

energy, in identifying the start and end points of utterances”, where “intonation” reads on “pitch”);

“identifying the endpoint of the utterance based on a length of time for which an energy value of the speech has remained below a predetermined energy value” (Page 8, lines 50-56, particularly reads on “this system looks backwards in time from the beginning of the period and forwards in time from the end of this period to discover the points where the energy falls to 10 per cent of the maximum values. This points are used to identify the start and end of the spoken word for analysis”).

As per claim 8, Peakman does not explicitly teach identifying the endpoint of the utterance based on the duration of the final syllable of the utterance. However, Lee teaches, identifying the endpoint of the utterance based on the duration of the final syllable of the utterance (col. 9, line 62 to col. 10, line 29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to identify an endpoint of a continuous speech using the final syllable of the utterance as taught by Lee because an skilled artisan would readily recognized that would particularly detect the end point of the utterance, which helps enhancement of the recognition process.

As per claim 2, the claim limitation is rejected based on the rational given to claim 8 above, and further Peckham teaches, “wherein said identifying an endpoint of the utterance based on the intonation comprises comparing the intonation with an intonation model” (Page 14, lines 36-56, particularly reads on “such as pitch and delta cepstrum may be used in the enrolment and verification process”).

As per claim 3, Peckham teaches, “further comprising determining the intonation by computing the fundamental frequency of the utterance” (Page 5, lines 32-33, particularly reads on “the input words are analysed to extract normalized cepstral coefficients and pitch” where pitch by definition is the fundamental frequency, see text book of Deller et al.).

As per claim 4, Peckham teaches, “wherein said determining the intonation comprises using an intonation model to determine the intonation” (Page 14, lines 36-56, particularly reads on “such as pitch and delta cepstrum may be used in the enrolment and verification process”).

As per claims 26-31, 34-37 and 39-40, they are interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 2-4 and 8, because essentially they have similar limitations and scope.

As per claim 9, Peckham teaches, “a method of operating an endpoint detector”, the method comprising:

“inputting speech representing an utterance, the utterance having an intonation” (Page 5, lines 32-33, particularly reads on “the input words are analysed to extract normalized cepstral coefficients and pitch” where “intonation” reads on “pitch”); and

As per claim 9, Peakham does not explicitly teach, “comparing the intonation of the utterance with an intonation model”;

“determining a probability based on a result of said comparing”; and  
“identifying an endpoint of the utterance based on the probability”.

However, Lee teaches, "comparing the intonation of the utterance with an intonation model" (col. 9, lines 62 to col. 10, line 30, here "intonation model" reads on "tone model");

"determining a probability based on a result of said comparing" (col. 9, lines 62 to col. 10, line 30, here possible end point is probability of the comparing results); and  
"identifying an endpoint of the utterance based on the probability" (col. 9, lines 62 to col. 10, line 30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Lee's teaching in the invention to identify endpoint of the utterance using tone model to calculate probable endpoint based on the comparing so that quickly an utterance is recognized based on the determination of starting and endpoint of the utterance.

As per claim 10, the claim limitation is rejected based on the rational given to claim 9 above, and further Peckham teaches, "further comprising determining the intonation of the utterance as a function of the fundamental frequency of the utterance" (Page 5, lines 32-33, particularly reads on "the input words are analysed to extract normalized cepstral coefficients and pitch" where pitch by definition is the fundamental frequency, see text book of Deller et al.).

As per claim 11, the claim limitation is rejected based on the rational given to claim 9 above, and further Peckham teaches, "determining a period of time that has elapsed since a value of the speech dropped below a threshold value" (Page 8, lines 50-56, particularly reads on "this system looks backwards in time from the beginning of

Art Unit: 2654

the period and forwards in time from the end of this period to discover the points where the energy falls to 10 per cent of the maximum values. This points are used to identify the start and end of the spoken word for analysis"); and

"wherein said identifying an endpoint of the utterance comprises identifying the endpoint of the utterance further based on the period of time" (Page 8, lines 50-56, particularly reads on "this system looks backwards in time from the beginning of the period and forwards in time from the end of this period to discover the points where the energy falls to 10 per cent of the maximum values. This points are used to identify the start and end of the spoken word for analysis").

As per claim 12, Peakman does not explicitly teach identifying the endpoint of the utterance based on the duration of the final syllable of the utterance. However, Lee teaches, identifying the endpoint of the utterance based on the duration of the final syllable of the utterance (col. 9, line 62 to col. 10, line 29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to identify an endpoint of a continues speech using the final syllable of the utterance as taught by Lee because an skilled artisan would readily recognized that would particularly detect the end point of the utterance, which helps enhancement of the recognition process.

As per claim 13, the claim limitation is rejected based on the rational given to claim 12 above, and further Peckham teaches, "wherein said identifying an endpoint of the utterance comprises identifying the endpoint of the utterance further based on a period of time for which an energy value of the speech has remained below a threshold value" (Page 8, lines 50-56, particularly reads on "this system looks backwards in time

Art Unit: 2654

from the beginning of the period and forwards in time from the end of this period to discover the points where the energy falls to 10 per cent of the maximum values. This points are used to identify the start and end of the spoken word for analysis").

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peckham et al. (EP 0 424 071) in view of Lee (US 6,067,520) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Zhao et al. (US 6,480,823).

As per claim 5, the claim limitation is rejected based on the rational given to claim 1 above, further, Peckham teaches, "wherein said identifying the endpoint of the utterance comprises identifying the endpoint of the utterance based on a plurality of knowledge sources, wherein one of the knowledge sources is intonation" (Page 8, lines 29-56, where plurality of knowledge sources are pitch (intonation), energy and time etc.). Peckham does not teach referencing the input speech against a histogram based on training data for each of the knowledge sources. However, Zhao teaches, a histogram database (Fig. 1, elements 38 and 40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to build a histogram database fore each of the knowledge source because Zhao teaches the invention will detect both the beginning and end of speech as well as handling situations where the beginning of speech may have been lost through truncation will provide a better detection of speech in the noise condition (col. 1, lines 54-58).

Art Unit: 2654

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 14-20 and 41 are allowed.
8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest "computing an overall end-of-utterance probability comprises computing the overall end-of-utterance probability as a function of the first, second, and third end-of-utterance probabilities".

***Contact Information***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Abul K. Azad** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3838**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richemond Dorvil**, can be reached at **(703) 305-9645**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents**

**P.O. Box 1450**

**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Or faxed to:

**(703) 872-9314**

(For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington,

VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2654

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center's Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Abul K. Azad

November 28, 2003



RICHEMOND DORVIL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER